UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

Why Wait for Others Before We Disarm?

By CHARLES F. DOLE

The Man from Mars Returns

By ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

The Story of My Mind—IX

By GEORGE WILLIS COOKE

VOLUME XCV NUMBER 9

Chicago, April 27, 1925

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES : *Editors* : FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

AND

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agents.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
George Saranton
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Robert B. Whitaker
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lucidi
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name .....

Address .....

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss) .....

Address .....

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 139
Why Wait for Others Before We Disarm?—REV. CHARLES F. DOLE 142
Jottings.—J. H. H. 143

ARTICLES—
The Hebrew University in Palestine—
I. *Charles P. Fagnani*
II. *Herbert Sidebotham* 144
The Man from Mars Returns.—ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY 146
The Story of My Mind. IX.—GEORGE WILLIS COOKE 147

POETRY—
"Crown Jewels."—ANGELA MORGAN 139

THE STUDY TABLE—
A New Picture of Jesus.—J. H. H. 149
A Book by Dr. Sunderland.—TARAKNATH DAS 149

CORRESPONDENCE—
The League of Nations—Essence and Excrescence.—REV. HENRY W. PINKHAM 150
Is UNITY Constructive?—M. L. 150
A Labor Leader Replies!—JAMES H. MAURER. 151

THE FIELD—
The Tenth Annual Meeting of the Union of Democratic Control 151
A Who's Who for American Labor 152
The International Polytechnical University (I. P. U.) 152

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCV — MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1925 — NUMBER 9

"CROWN JEWELS"

I cannot keep from thinking how this crown
Would save the people of some stricken town;
And how this ruby's glow were more divine
If to the famished it were bread and wine.
These crusted fires upon a golden sword,
These hoarded gems of earl and knight and lord—
One handful of their blazonry would bring
A year of comfort to the suffering.

I cannot help but reason how this cup
Wherefrom the ancient kings were wont to sup;
This platter of superbly carvéd gold,
These flashing forks a princess used to hold;
These tankards and these goblets, furnace-bright,
This ecstasy of jewels rainbow-white;
This pomp and passion of supreme display,
Would make the hungry happy for a day.

O sword of Mercy, idle when they wept;
O blade of Justice, on your cushion kept;
Leap forth in fiery language that shall speak
The old, persistent sorrow of the weak.
Bring food and fire and love unto their door,
Be swift salvation to the starving poor.
O jewels waiting for a monarch's head—
The children of the nations die for bread!

For UNITY. ANGELA MORGAN.

The Outlawry of War has been given impressive support in the Memorial recently presented to President Coolidge, urging him to include Outlawry, as well as the further limitation of arms, in his proposed international conference. This Memorial was signed by a long list of most distinguished men, hitherto not associated in any way with the Outlawry of War program. Some of these men are: Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, President of the Federal Council of Churches, Cardinal Hayes, President Benjamin Ide Wheeler, Governor George W. P. Hunt of Arizona, Adolph Lewisohn of New York, Bishop Brewster of Maine, Dr. Henry Van Dyke, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, Gen. Henry T. Allen, Bishop Brent, Former Governor Allen of Kansas, President Burton of the University of Chicago, President Hopkins of Dartmouth, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Hon. Judson Harmon, President Thwing of Western Reserve University, Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve, of Barnard, and Mr. R. Fulton Cutting of New York. It is rather amusing to find among these signers not one of the outstanding advocates of Outlawry who have borne the heat and burden of battle in recent years, with the single exception of Justice Florence E. Allen. It is a pity, also, to find the Outlawry program tangled up in the Memorial with the Geneva Protocol. It is an additional pity to find this Memorial limiting its interest to the "outlawry of *aggressive* war." But these are non-essential facts as compared with the one great fact that here is a large group of distinguished citizens committing themselves to the support of "the great cause of the outlawry of war," and petitioning the President to present it for international discussion as the next and indispensable step toward the attainment of real peace upon the earth. We are not so pessimistic as to believe with the signers of this Memorial that "the great cause of the Outlawry of War would seem lost unless a conference convened by you (the President) results in the uniting of the nations in a practical plan that will outlaw any nation guilty of aggressive war." The Outlawry program is going to survive and win out whether President Coolidge's proposed conference deals with it or not! But we heartily agree with the statement in this Memorial that the success of Outlawry

> would be an achievement surpassing in its greatness and splendid beneficence any known in the history of the world. Should it achieve in any large measure its noble end, it would be no less than a reversal of history, making its records in the future not the records of wars as in all the past, but of the accomplishments of peace.

At last!—the League of Nations is doing something. Thrilling moment in the history of mankind when this august organization, after years of struggle and failure, at last achieves success! For behold the wonderful news straight from Geneva, that the League is preparing to proclaim annually to the world a list of the six hundred best books! Here is what humanity has been waiting for since 1914. Here is the cause for which ten millions of young men laid down their lives upon the field of battle. Here is the compensation sought by countless agonized hearts for all the incalculable loss of blood and treasure in the Great War. To this end was the League of Nations born, and to this end came it into the world, of course. Men want to know what are the best books written and published each year. They yearn to learn the greatest writers and the most important titles. Peace is obviously secondary to this essentially and fundamentally and ultimately important thing. If this question of books can only be decided, who cares about armies and navies, or the dread horrors of war itself? Wars may come and wars may go, but if only that great League upon the shores of Lake Geneva can name the six hundred best books, the world is saved forever. But why stop at books? Let the League go on and announce the one

hundred best canvases painted every year, the two hundred best musical compositions produced, the three hundred best plays shown in the theaters. Then let us know the best magazines for our boys and girls, the best games for the kindergarten, and by all means the best cross-word puzzles. Shall the heart of the world be broken that these revelations are denied? The League must fulfil its aims—do what mankind asked it to do when it was established. Then, with such triumphs to its credit, the Senate's opposition must collapse, and even UNITY lower its flag and drop its sword. We shall await with bated breath the first list of "the noble six hundred." Its publication will surely mark a new era in the history of the race.

On the morning of Thursday, April 9th, we had such feelings of terror as can come, we imagine, only to those who anticipate the end of the world on a certain appointed day. For when we looked at our newspapers on the date in question, we saw on the front pages, proclaimed by enormous headlines, the utterance by Count Michael Karolyi, Hungary, which he had been prevented from speaking in this country by the gag of the State Department. Our cheeks blanched, our eyes grew dim, our breath ceased, as we saw this awful news. Tremblingly we laid down our paper! Vast disaster must now come to our country speedily as this story of Karolyi's words spreads abroad among the people. Would it be in the form of rioting, rebellion, or armed invasion from abroad? Would buildings fall, the great structures of government in Washington come tumbling to the ground, or perhaps attempts at assassination be made upon our public officials? Or would the cataclysm take the form of some great upheaval of nature? We waited for earthquakes to shake the land, tidal waves to sweep the sea, perhaps the whole continent to sink beneath the waves of the all-encompassing ocean. Or would mountains be consumed by fire, populations engulfed in hurricanes, the very stars come tumbling from the heavens? It was a fearful moment! But time passed—five minutes, a half hour, an hour, and nothing happened! We went to the window and looked abroad upon the world. The sky was blue, the sun was shining bright, buildings were all standing—yes, there was a policeman, so the government had not yet been destroyed. There were even people on the streets, going about their business just as though no vast disaster had occurred at all. Strange! Was it possible that Count Karolyi could thus speak freely, and *nothing happen?* Overwhelmed with sheer relief and amazement, we turned at evening to our paper, and there read again Count Karolyi's statement beginning, "Now that I am on British soil, I can speak out loud. . . ." *"Now that I am on British soil"!!* Again we were overwhelmed—this time with shame for America.

If there is any cause in this country which seems persistently doomed to get "a raw deal"—to use a vulgar but vivid phrase—it is the cause of government ownership. Why is it denied a fair show, a real opportunity to prove its merits? Why is it tried only when it is certain to fail, and refused a trial when it is reasonably sure of success? When the public ownership question is raised in New York City, everybody holds up his hands in holy horror, and cries, "Look at the municipal ferries!" Yes, we reply, look at the municipal ferries! Not one of them taken over by the city until they had become bankrupt in private hands because of the bridges and tubes, and now run by the city because nobody else will run them at a loss. Instead of using this instance as a test of government ownership, why not let the city take over the Fifth Avenue busses for a time and see what it could do. But, O no! The busses are enormous money-makers, sure-fire profit machines, so of course they must be kept in private hands. The railroads are another example. They were taken over and run by the government—when? Why, during the war, when private management was certain to break down, because a maximum service must be rendered at *any* cost. The moment the emergency was over, and it was possible to get the railroads on a paying basis once again, they were passed back to the private owners. And we call this a test of government ownership—a proof of its inevitable failure! Another conspicuous instance of this same thing was rather amazingly dramatized in the last Congress in the Muscles Shoals and the Cape Cod Canal bills. Muscles Shoals represents a fabulously rich deposit of natural wealth, certain of enormously profitable development. Therefore the government must have nothing to do with it, must pass it over into private hands for exploitation as provided by the Underwood Bill! The Cape Cod Canal *per contra,* built and operated by private capital, is a financial failure. Therefore it must be purchased by the government, as provided by the bill in question, to be run at an inevitable loss and to serve as one more illustration of the folly of public ownership! It is this sort of thing that we call "a raw deal." Let private capital run the business that is certain to succeed; let the government run the business that is certain to fail! This is grossly unfair. Yet even so, we believe in public ownership, for it at least gives us service in place of profit. Who of us would think of such a thing as turning back the postal and the express business into private hands?

Speaking of government ownership, we count it a tragedy that the voters of Chicago refused to take over the car-lines of that city as proposed by Mayor Dever. Municipal ownership is the wise and inevitable first step in any progress toward the wider control of public resources and utilities, and here was a chance to try out the experiment on a larger scale than ever before at-

tempted in this country. We do not know enough about Chicago to know what causes were at work to end the contest in defeat. We suppose that the contending ambitions of politicians, the newspaper support which is fatal to any scheme these days (such is the public suspicion of the press!), the exceedingly favorable conditions offered to the hated traction companies, all played their part. But we are inclined to believe, on general principles, that at bottom there was nothing quite so potent at work as the prevailing distrust these days of all progressive proposals, the spirit of reaction to which we have already made reference in these columns. Never before in the history of this country have the people been so hostile to change, so content with things as they are and always have been. Any proposal to alter things a bit, no matter what it may be, is frowned upon at once. So fearful is the public of moving at all, that it will gladly endure a situation so nearly intolerable as the Chicago traction muddle, rather than stir in any direction, least of all forward to so drastic a remedy as municipal ownership. Strange that such a blight of inertia should befall the nation! But here it is, and we might as well make up our minds that nothing of any kind can be accomplished along lines of constructive progress, until this blight is lifted. Somebody probably whispered in Chicago that Moscow owned its car-lines—and that settled it!

The recent Birth Control Conference held in New York under the leadership of that truly remarkable woman, Margaret Sanger, proved to be an occasion of great public importance. Scientists and reformers were gathered from all quarters of the globe, and for a week met together in earnest discussion of the limitation of population. Small group meetings, tightly closed against the public, considered the problems of technique in the birth control program. Larger meetings, to which the general public were earnestly invited, presented the social, economic and moral phases of the subject. Two aspects of the general problem were brought into great prominence. In the first place, it was shown that the increase of population is fast becoming a matter of such urgency as to revive the doctrine of Malthus and to justify the dubbing of the birth control movement as a neo-Malthusian movement. Professor East's book, "Mankind at the Crossroads," gives the best presentation in book form of the crisis now confronting the world. He estimates that the saturation point is something like three thousand five hundred million people, and that this total, at the present rate of increase, will be reached before the year 2000. There is no way to meet this horror, except by the systematic application of birth control methods. In the second place, the Conference demonstrated that more important than the quantitative problem, is the qualitative problem. Here the birth control movement climbs to high ground! It seeks not merely to escape overcrowding of population, but the improvement in the quality of the physical, moral and spiritual character of the individual. From the birth control point of view, the large family is just as undesirable in prosperous New Zealand as in struggling Russia, in empty Canada as in crowded China. The worn-out mother and the neglected child lead to ills innumerable, which can alone be avoided by the limitation of the family. This Conference in New York proved once for all that birth control is neither a fad nor a fanaticism, but one of the greatest and most pressing of all movements for human welfare and happiness. It is doubtful if any woman of our time, or for many centuries passed, will be longer or more gratefully remembered by humankind than Margaret Sanger.

The arrival of the circus, coincident with the advent of Spring, brings anew to our attention one of the great, unsolved mysteries of our life. Every year since we have been in New York, the circus has come to Madison Square Garden the first of April, and begun its season's performances. Every year, as regularly as the procession of the calendar, we are told by the newspapers that the circus is meeting with unprecedented success. "The audiences are the largest in its history"—"all records for attendance have been broken," is the way the story runs! For eighteen years, now, we have read this annual press report. We have seldom seen such a record for consistent progress in all our experience. But what does it mean? Madison Square Garden is the same place to-day that it was two decades ago. It has no more space now than it had then, no larger seating capacity, no more extensive room for audiences. *Hence*—if attendance has been steadily greater each year through all these years, what on earth could it have been in the beginning? Did the circus play in those days to empty or near-empty benches? If so, we were not told! And exactly similar query is raised by Easter. As regularly each year as this religious festival recurs, we read in the Monday morning papers, that the attendance at the churches on the preceding day was of unprecedented proportions. Rain or shine, cold or warm, the congregations are always larger than ever before. Great is the growth of the church! Wonderful is the progress of religion! *But*—the church edifices are the same that they were yesterday; or, if there are new ones, they are most of them smaller than the old. Which raises again the question—what could the congregations have been a score of years ago, if they have increased in numbers regularly each year since? Of course, as a matter of fact, with the church as with the circus, our mystery is only an apparent mystery. What we have in both cases is one more instance of "bunk"!

Why Wait for Others Before We Disarm?

We often hear people who desire national disarmament cheerfully remark: "Of course we must wait for the other nations to agree to disarm. No nation can disarm alone." We are specially apt to hear this from pious men who are always ready to agree with what the militarists tell us. But why must a nation be helpless to disarm on its own motion, without asking the consent of its neighbors? Even now we have been reading that Denmark will quite possibly pass an act for substantially total military and naval demilitarization. No one is shocked; no one fears that Denmark is destroying herself. Is such a course of international conduct safe and practicable for a little nation but at once dangerous and impossible for a strong nation? Is a small Baltic people situated close to the hot seat of the late war, free to go ahead and dismiss her forces without losing anyone's respect, and is it an unspeakable idea that the United States might assume the same liberty?

Please think what would happen in case the American people voted to withhhold military appropriations from as early as 1930 and onwards. Of course we should keep the Departments of the Army and Navy in commission, so far as would be necessary for the generous care of the men to whom the nation is under obligation as the honorable servants of the discarded war system.

The proposal that the United States, having caught the idea of the utter fatuity of war, henceforth neither intends nor expects to go to war again, would be the most startling and magnificent proclamation of good tidings to the world that has ever been uttered. We have hardly an idea how greatly the world needs just this reassurance. Everywhere the tension and nervousness of war strain still prevail. No other people is in our position so safely to afford this noble relief. Being a gesture of friendliness and confidence, it would doubtless win back to us our old reputation as "the most favored nation."

What dangers now should we incur? Call the roll of all the nations (there are only about sixty in all) and tell us who would think ill of us? There is no people anywhere whom we have reason to fear or who have reason to bear us ill will. Why should gentlemen keep up defences against one another? If there is a complaint to be made, bring it forward, and we stand ready to adjudicate it. We shall have outlawed war and have thus forevermore ceased to have any reason to rattle a sword. The gestures and manners and temper of belligerency will disappear along with the murderous weapons in the use of which war has flourished.

Moreover, our proposition at once puts out of our way certain highly undemocratic claims and practices which even now threaten the security of the world. Since the days of Imperial Rome, certain extra strong Powers, following the arrogant Roman precedent to behave as Cock of the Walk, especially on the ocean, have assumed prerogatives for their subjects, their travelers and explorers and merchants, and later of their missionaries also, as enjoying rights in the backward parts of the earth such as weaker nations cannot presume to expect. The story of the various treaties forced by the great European nations upon China is one long record of indignity, oppression and calamity. The United States has easily fallen under the sway of the same kind of unwarrantable imperialistic practices. What real right had we as a nation to meddle with the financial or political delinquencies of little nations such as Hayti and Santo Domingo? King George III never did anything more offensive and unrighteous than we have done in landing marines from our warships on the soil of countries whose language most of us do not understand. We claim that one of the sources of unexpected war will be dried up so soon as we cheerfully relinquish the claim that our wealth and power give us meddlesome rights over the smallest nation on the earth.

The fact is, that we have never had serious reason for fear that people overseas would invade our territory or take away our liberties. At what period of our history has there been an occasion for such a fear? For the most part we have lived on the most amicable terms with our neighbors, who never have made a show of attacking us. But we have been pleased, like boys, to "follow the fashion" that the others set us in making display of our sea power. The extraordinary techiness of our American Congress a year ago in misunderstanding the language of the Japanese Ambassador in the matter of the new immigration laws was a frightful instance how grown-up men may be willing to stake the friendly relations of great peoples over a fancied insult. This is because hundreds of great ships are ready to fight at the call of a telephone. We shall have taken an immense insurance for international safety in putting certain kinds of surly boyish behavior out of reach of our government officials. We will not contemplate any issues over which we would fight with our neighbors. We hold it preposterous therefore to carry arms any longer.

Someone may remind us that a constitutional reason exists for maintaining an army to protect us against domestic perils—against possible riots, rebellion and civil war. But here is the most ghastly form in which we can contemplate war. Do we seriously expect the likelihood of being obliged to shoot down our own people in our streets? In other words, have we no more rational and humane precautions against riots than the threat to kill people, who presumably will answer back by trying to kill us? Consider what a terrible

enginery we are sanctioning in establishing a permanent armed force in our country to be called out for an expected orgy of destruction! When in the history of civil tragedies do we find facts to encourage us to keep a force of men trained to kill their own people? Where has such force ever been used without the deadly sequence of class feeling, bitterness, hate, fear and ever more fear—the inevitable conclusion of war?

The truth is, that domestic war is peculiarly incompatible with the nature of a democratic government. There may be occasions of popular excitement and grievance. Let us then provide against the occurrence of such occasions. Let us set forth the effectiveness of courage, kindliness, and a decent confidence in the general good will of the people. Let us understand and publish the everlasting difference of aim and normal use between soldiery, led to shoot and kill, and the peaceable police who are the servants of all the people.

We maintain then that from every actual peril from within or without we shall be freer from the day we publish to all mankind that we desire nothing at home, or in any part of the earth, that needs to be pursued by the bloody hands of soldiers, or forced from unwilling peoples by the threat of destroying their lives or property. Let men everywhere think and give answer whether this is not true. If it is true, why not be first to say it to our neighbors instead of waiting for them to say it?

Please observe now that the usual and historic development of moral reform is that for which we ask. A single merchant, for example, adopts a new standard of business, and many a time proves it out alone, whereupon other merchants are emboldened to essay the experiment. The most vital days in the temperance movement were when individuals, here one and then another, of their own free choice dropped the use of alcohol. Even now it may be observed that the new movement to outlaw war comes in by the action of individuals. We will not admit that there must be another war. But if such a war were kindled, is it not evident that it might well be stopped, not by votes in a plebiscite, but by perhaps only a minority of the people, acting each as individuals and deliberately overcoming a hasty, angry or bloody will to war by the solemn and cheerful determination not to permit this great wrong! Any government today would be crazy to venture to shoot or jail any considerable number of its own people for the military offense of refusing to kill men. Moreover, the rapid growth of the "Youth Movement" already demonstrates that whatever stand the determined non-resistants take in one country, their friends of the good spirit will take in every land where war threatens. A minority, acting for the general good, will hold the balance of power.

It will, however, be a great step in the annihilation of war, when one of the big nations, and preferably the United States, undertakes by proper legislative action to lead the procession which we are confident all the other peoples would hasten to make up to win the world to permanent peace. Already we who hate war suffer "a veritable conscription" in that considerable amounts of money are extorted continually from us for the preparations of war. We do not pay this part of our taxes, as we pay more or less cheerfully our other public dues. This is "blood money," and if we could be sure how to distinguish this part from the rest, we should have to pay every dollar of it under protest.

As our view of this immense subject becomes more common (as it is bound to), we shall proceed to deny the right of any majority to levy war taxes upon us; we hold such levies altogether destructive and inhuman, in fact nothing but the survival of ancient foolishness and superstition. Our usual majority rule is obviously a matter of convenience to which we good-naturedly agree only in regard to subjects that involve no question of conscience. But the will of a majority to do a wickedness can be no more sacred or binding than the will of a tyrant. To whom does not this statement come as the announcement of a gospel for all peoples?

We close with remarkable and prophetic words from Nietzsche:

> The so-called armed peace that prevails at present is a sign of a bellicose disposition that trusts neither itself nor its neighbor. Better to perish than to hate and fear, and twice as far better to perish than to make oneself hated and feared—this must some day become the supreme maxim of every political community.

Nietzsche, moreover, says that it will be the part of the greatest and most enlightened nation to precede the others in destroying "its whole military system, lock, stock and barrel," and this voluntarily, from a noble "loftiness of sentiment." Has not America a religion vital enough to catch this appeal?

CHARLES F. DOLE.

Jottings

We have been told that there are limits to human idiocy. We are tempted to doubt it, however, when we find the editor of a great newspaper stating that "the practise cannonading of our Grand Fleet (in the Pacific) is no presage of future wars, but promises future peace." A man who can believe and write such a sentence as that, after the experience of the Great War, certainly extends the bounds of idiocy to infinity. Those guns on the Pacific are bringing a war with Japan just so much the nearer every day!

"The most impressive sight we saw in Russia," says an American recently returned, "was the Red Army

marching on Christmas Eve, with books under their arms instead of guns."

Week after week we receive from India that impressive little paper of liberal religious thought, *The World and the New Dispensation.* We read it faithfully, with profit—and always with growing amazement that its columns contain no slightest reference to what is going on in India to-day. If this were the only Indian paper we read, we should never know that such a man as Gandhi was alive, or such a movement as Non-Co-operation under way. We have never encountered such an instance of philosophical detachment.

We read a newspaper despatch telling of the denunciation of certain college professors in Ohio as "reds." In following through the despatch to the end, we find that the basis of the charge is that the professors in question are members of a branch of the "Committee of 48." We wonder if Moscow would recognize these children!

Average wages in the United States, measured in the food they will buy, are more than twice as high as those in London, three times greater than those in Paris, nearly five times greater than those in Rome and Vienna. Is it any wonder that labor in this country is contented and conservative? Leave well enough alone is the slogan of the hour.

In a little town in Maine which shall be nameless, there are two churches, with two distinct and separate congregations. But the same minister preaches to both —in the morning to one, and in the evening to the other. We wonder if he uses the same sermon! J. H. H.

The Hebrew University in Palestine

[The dedication of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem on April 1st is an event which has stirred not only Israel but the world. We present herewith two articles in celebration and interpretation of this dramatic event.—Ed.]

I.

A Royal Diadem in the Hand of God

Not every Jew is a Zionist. Not every Jew need be a Zionist. Some Jews emphasize the universal, inclusive, international outlook of Judaism. There are others, to whom the traditional, national, more exclusive aspects of their inherited faith are sacred.

But all Jews, whether Zionists or not, and all Gentiles as well, must look upon the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus, and its inauguration on April 1st, with profoundest interest.

One of the beneficent results, all too few, of the late, lamentable war, was the liberation of Palestine from the century-long misrule of the Turk.

There is something infinitely touching, and marvelously romantic in the restoration to the Jews, to partial control at least, of the land of their ancestors, from which they have been exiles these many, many centuries.

The wailing at the Wall is hushed now! Who dared to hope, a brief decade ago that the age-long mourning would so soon give place to joyous Hallelu-jahs.

How fitting it is, how characteristic of the undying idealism of Judaism that one of the first monuments with which to celebrate the return from exile should be a great University, an institution devoted to the free, untrammeled research for Truth, to thinking the thoughts of God after Him: Following the gleam as it leads ever onward into the infinite wonders of the world which Adonay made, and pronounced very good.

Among the speakers at the inauguration was to be the world's most famous Jew—Chaim Weizmann.

Who can picture the emotions in the breast of this illustrious son of Israel, as he stood upon Mount Scopus, where Cestius Gallus, Legate of Syria, once had his camp; from which Titus, the Emperor Vespasian's son, surveyed spread out before him, the Holy City which he had come to destroy.

For the first time since the Romans laid it low, 1900 years ago, Jerusalem is free!

The University of Jerusalem is to be Zionism's chiefest glory. At the meeting point of three continents, it will spread its beneficent and illuminating influence abroad. Its appeal will be to all peoples.

It will be a crown of beauty in the Land of Adonay, and a royal diadem in the hand of our God.

—*Charles P. Fagnani.*

Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

II

The University of Jerusalem

I have been asked to write about the effects which the foundation of the new University of Jerusalem may have on the world, in particular on the Near East. Lord Balfour, who opened the University, is an elder British statesman from whom advancing years have purged all the vice of Imperialism. It is in great measure due to him that Palestine has been established as a national center for all Jewry and when he opens the University of Jerusalem the least thought in his mind will be that of advancing any selfish imperial design. His is a philosophic mind and it will measure the importance of the new university not by the degree in which it will advance this or that secular interest but solely by the hope that it will enrich our world-civilization and quicken the dry bones of learning in the East. I have some reason to know how real is the philosophic detachment with which he has approached this great problem of Jewish nationalism from the first. For when, in my ardor of commending Zionism to the favor of English people, I have stressed the identity of Jewish and British interests in the Near East, the suggestion has been conveyed to me from quarters that I have little doubt reflected Lord Balfour's opinion that the argument could be pushed too far and that Zionism was a world movement which must not be made to revolve in the

orbit of any single nation. Let me therefore in this article try to catch some of the spirit of Lord Balfour's philosophic detachment. For if the implied rebuke of Lord Balfour for maintaining the identity of British and Zionist interests holds good in the domain of mere politics, how much more pertinent is its application to the domain of intellect of which a university is the capital?

First, then, let us consider the influence which the new University will have in Jewry outside Palestine. The Jew is an international. He absorbs the culture of the country in which he lives and in return makes most powerful contributions to it; but always, I should say, there is no distinguishing characteristic of the Jewish genius. His is a deductive mind; that is to say, it tends to reason from one general principle to a further general principle. The English and the American mind is on the contrary inductive; that is to say, it discovers its general principles shyly and tardily from a great number of particular instances. Matthew Arnold, in a celebrated passage, has contrasted the Hebraism of the Jews and the Hellenism of the Greek. The Jew is the man who invented the sense of sin and refers everything to the terms of his morality, whereas the standards of the Greek, alike in morals and in art, are purely aesthetic. The natural Jew is always a moralist first, an artist second; the Greek mind on the other hand sees, reverses the process and conceives his moral ideas in the terms of art. This antithesis came to a violent clash in the struggle between the Maccabees and the Greek Syrian rulers. But always there was an affinity between the Jew and the Greek in purely intellectual processes. Both are deductive reasoners; both regard facts as the illustrations not as the masters of theory.

This mental tendency in the Jew has been encouraged by the fact that he belonged to every country but possessed none. Always in his speculations on political theory he has been dealing with what was not his own; he has, in politics, been the bailee, so to say, never the owner of what he was dealing with. I can imagine the new university in the capital of Jewry developing not only in Palestine but all over the world a different habit of mind. The Jew will never lose his readiness in the uptake of a new idea and there may spring up in the new University a philosophy of history, that is distinctive and may enrich the political theories of the world. But at the same time his conservative tendencies will be strengthened. A man is more careful when he is dealing with his own, and, faced with the practical problem of founding a Jewish national civilization, he will have every motive to acquire the gift of political compromise and of adapting means to ends. These are not mere generalities, for the great value of a university is not in the facts that it teaches but in the subtle influences of its philosophy. In time the influence of the University at Jerusalem may radiate to the ends of the earth and sensibly affect both the Jewish and the Gentile philosophy of life and politics.

The effect of the new University of Jewish life in Palestine will be more immediate. Two faculties which are to be founded at once are one of Semitic Studies and a second of Eastern Diseases. The choice is typical of the directions in which the minds of its founders are working. Zionism in Palestine without a university might run to seed in several ways. It might become wholly absorbed in the purely material work of developing a long neglected estate, and make of Palestine a mere plantation run by Jews but only in the sense in which Spain ran its South American colonies. Or again it might become an unpractical enthusiastic idealism neglecting the duty that is on colonizers of subduing nature and developing the resources of the land they love. The main duty of the new university will be to hold the balance even between the practical and the ideal. The school of Eastern Diseases is evidence of the realism with which Zionists are attacking their problems. Palestine is a small country and if it is to become a state capable of standing alone it can only be by intensive culture. There must be no part of it unfit for habitation by reason of disease; by extirpating malaria you could in effect add large areas to the country that are now derelict; and science alone must show the way to the completest economic efficiency. At the same time the university must keep alive the ideal. The fact that the new university will have no religious tests and will be in no sense sectarian makes it the more important that side by side with the new scientific faculties there should be studies in the Hebrew classic Kultur.

The new University will be the only genuine university in the East. The so-called Moslem Universities at Cairo, for example, are very little more than elementary schools, and worse still, their instruction is purely formalistic and consists in learning by heart passages from the Koran. If it were possible to imagine mediæval Oxford filled with its thousands of boy students learning by rote "Barbara Celarent" and the tags of the Aristotelian formal logic, we should have a rough parallel to the Moslem universities of which Cairo is the type. Such universities have no more influence on modern life than an Oxford such as we have imagined would have on modern England. Indeed, so far from stimulating thought they merely kill, and for any real instruction in modern subjects the Moslem must leave his own country and come to Europe. I am not forgetting the Robert College in Constantinople, an admirable American institution which does excellent work, but this is after all an alien institution which is in but not of the country. The new University of Jerusalem will be modern but it will be definitely Oriental and not a mere importation from abroad. Despite the temporary artificial estrangement from the Jew that is fostered by agitators, the Arab has no difficuly in recognizing his racial affinity. The Jew has been a long time away from the East and has acquired great experience and knowledge and a knowledge of Western arts, science and ways; but in the East he is an Oriental. What is more, he has a long history of friendship with the Arabs when they were at the zenith of their greatness. In medicine, philosophy, and statecraft this Arab civilization was largely Jewish, so close was the co-operation between Arab and Jew at this time. If those old relations could be renewed, Jews would ask for nothing better, and of all the means that could be devised to that end, none is so hopeful as the establishment of the new university.

It is not a purely Jewish institution and its doors will be open to all alike who wish to avail themselves of the new learning. One of the hopes of its establishment would be disappointed if Arabs from Palestine and elsewhere do not attend its courses. If they do, the foundations of the University may date the beginning of a great revival of learning in the East comparable with that of the Renaissance. The cycle of history would come full cycle round if, just as the capture of Constantinople by the Turks brought Europe its great Renaissance and the beginnings of modern scholarship and science, the expulsion of the Turks from Palestine and the establishment there of the Jew were to take a

Renaissance to the East. For the effects of such a Renaissance would not be confined to Palestine alone but would spread throughout the East. Its effects on the East would be great alike in the material and in the moral sphere. Education in the East would bring back its ancient glories and (to put the argument on its lowest ground) might add to the wealth of the world an access comparable to that which the discovery and development of the Americas brought.

The New Palestine. —*Herbert Sidebotham.*

The Man from Mars Returns

A drizzling rain kept me indoors. I was impatient because I had planned a long walk for the afternoon. Not feeling like reading, I sat watching the fire and listening to the beating of the rain. The bell rang, and I went to the door. On opening it, I saw a face that I recognized immediately. It was the Man from Mars.

"What brings you here," I said, "on such a day as this?" But before he could answer, I added, "Come in out of the rain."

He folded his umbrella, and putting it against the door frame, stepped inside without a word. I helped him off with his coat, and asked him more cordially than I had on his previous visit to step in and take a chair by the fire.

"Well, what brings you here?" I asked again.

"Oh, I make a journey to the Earth about once a year. I prefer usually to come earlier when it is colder weather. It is easier for me to get around then."

As he did not continue, we both sat for a time looking at the fire. Then I asked, "Did you come on any special business?"

"Oh, no," he replied. "I have just been having a look about. I have been finding some things that interest me, as I did on my former visits. I really planned to get here sooner, but, do you know, there was so much infernal jazz in the air that it was impossible for me to get through. So I stayed up there dancing for an interminable length of time. I doubt if I ever could have gotten through if it had not been for the eclipse. That seemed to knock those infernal machines out of business, so I dropped down on the Earth."

"Hm," said I, "my boy told me that his radio didn't work on account of the eclipse. It was fortunate for you that it occurred, for I doubt if you could have found another moment to slip through. We load the air with jazz week in and week out."

"So it seems," he said. After a pause, he added, "Well, I got through at last. What troubles me now is how I am going to get back."

"Perhaps you can wait until we are celebrating the establishment of peace," I said with a smile. "On account of that maybe we will put off jazz for a day or two."

"I have no hope of that," he said.

"Well, for your sake I hope something will turn up so that you can get back home."

"Oh, I'm not worrying about it. But I dropped in just to ask you a question. You being a minister, I thought perhaps you could explain this curious thing to me."

"I couldn't explain to you this matter of church wars on your last trip. I don't see why you come to me."

"Oh, well, I enjoyed your fire, and thought I would try you once more."

"What is it that troubles you?"

"Well, it seems to be a very small matter here on Earth, but up in Mars we would think it an important thing, I am sure. I went to a meeting in New York,—dropped in by accident,—and I heard people talking about child labor, and there I made a curious discovery, that apparently your industry in this country depends on the labor of little children. Something like a million of these little folks, they said, it is found necessary to employ in gainful occupations."

"Surely. Is it anything strange," I said, "that children should work? Isn't work necessary?"

"Oh, yes. But we have a little different notion up in Mars. You know, we think that little children should have a right to be children,—should play, and be out in the sunshine, before the time arrives for them to assume the responsibilities of life."

"Some of us think so too."

"Yes," said the Man from Mars, with a strange expression on his face. "That is what they said at the meeting, but what I could not understand is this: will all your churches which are devoted to the worship of Jesus, whom you say loved little children, I cannot understand how it is that you can coin the very life blood, even the souls of little children, into gold."

"Oh, you're wrong about that. We have no alchemy by which we can turn our blood and souls into gold."

"Well, you are a minister and perhaps you don't understand how gold is made. We won't discuss that. After the New York meeting I went down south, and went into a mill where some little children were working all night long. Their faces were pale and their bodies were so thin that the very sight of them made me heartsick. And the strange thing about it was that every one of those faces looked very much to me like the face of Jesus. What made them, can you tell me?"

It was a hard question, and I really didn't want to answer it. I sat for a long time looking at the fire. My heart grew heavier and heavier.

I heard the Man from Mars say, "I see you are defeating the child labor amendment."

A moment later he said, "I hear the bitter cry of children."

And still I looked into the fire.

"Is it not strange?" he said. I nodded my head sadly.

There was a long silence, and when I looked up, to my surprise, the Man from Mars had gone.

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY.

The Story of My Mind

IX.

It is not to be assumed that I was an extreme radical, that I cut myself off from the common currents of religious thinking in my day. Such was not the case, for I accepted those ideas and ideals which were common to the persons to whom I spoke, and I attempted to voice what would have meaning to them. I was not regarded as an extremist in any direction, and I attempted to speak with moderation and intellectual judgment. It is not to be supposed, however, that with the opinions I had come to hold, I kept strictly within the conventional limits of church utterance. I was always breaking over the bounds of pulpit propriety as regards the subjects I was drawn to, if not as to the conclusions reached.

At this period religion seemed to me coterminous with human life and its interests. I could not regard it as confined within a little round of practical subjects or as appealing to those ethical motives and comfortable views of life which so often define its range of interests and subjects of presentation. Accordingly, in Grand Haven I gave a course of Sunday evening lectures on the leaders of liberal religion in the United States, another on the Oriental religions as well as that on the Bible. In Indianapolis I delivered on Sunday afternoons in a theatre a course on Rousseau, Voltaire, Hume, Paine, and Ingersoll. I had a good hearing, and for a few months my congregation was increased. In the church I gave a course on the practical reforms most under consideration at the time, including charity, crime, pauperism, and kindred subjects. The first lecture was on the nature of human society and the forces which give it meaning and purpose. Indirectly I was much influenced by the theories of Hegel, of which I had a somewhat vague knowledge. When I printed this lecture in *The Evolution,* I received a postal card from William T. Harris, then the Superintendent of Schools in St. Louis, and editor of *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy,* on which he wrote that it was the best presentation of the subject he had read. I announced these lectures in the Socialist weekly paper then printed in Indianapolis. The editor attended the whole course, and devoted a column each week to criticism of my statements. I was then a strong individualist, but was convinced that there was an urgent demand for reform and the regeneration of society. I also gave a course of four or five lectures on the teachings of Emerson, to which I had given much attention, and which I accepted with convinced faith in their value and their ethical importance. At this time there was proceeding a widespread discussion as to whether Emerson had changed his attitude towards Christianity in his later years, and whether his return to church attendance meant any real change in opinions. This conclusion had been favored by some assertions of Emerson's neighbor in Concord, Amos Bronson Alcott, and which had been vigorously proclaimed in his Monday lectures in Boston by Joseph Cook. My last lecture was devoted to an answer to these assertions, and it was printed in a weekly Indianapolis journal, *The Saturday Evening Herald,* from which it was copied into the New York *Tribune,* the *Free Religious Index,* and the *Commonwealth of Boston,* as well as into other newspapers. It brought to an end the discussion in regard to Emerson's change of religious attitude.

It appears to me now that my ideas at this period were largely chaotic and not effectively organized. I was greatly interested in science, but its more materialistic teachings made me hesitate. I did not know enough in an experimental way about its methods and its results to judge clearly of its final bearings on ethics and religion. I was often puzzled at its conclusions and distrustful of its seeming antagonism to the more spiritual view of life. The result was that I adhered rather convincedly to the idealistic philosophy and its conclusions. At that period idealism was so much in the air, had such a vigorous hold on the thinking of those with whom I was most intimate, and was such a large element in the literature which I most read and admired, that I gradually gave a larger adherence to the idealism of Emerson and his fellow thinkers.

Through all this period, heretic as I was from the point of view of the church, and indifferent as I became to the generally accepted beliefs of the time, I felt deeply that religion had a great meaning, that there was in it a vast sustaining power, and that it might be made of the utmost importance as a liberalizing and educational agency. I did not in any sense regard myself as a priest, as standing between God and man, and as mediating God's will to my hearers. Rather, I regarded my work as that of the teacher, as that of one joining in the educational advance of the people. To me my work seemed to be that of liberating the mind, its rational instruction, and its inspiration with higher and better motives for thinking and conduct. I was, therefore, in my own thought reforming, in my own little way, the world immediately around me, by means of sermon and lecture. Much of the work done by me, and by those who thought with me, was carried on in classes, by means of clubs devoted to the extension of culture and the diffusion of modern ideas. This educational work seemed to me of the greatest importance, and as chiefly characteristic of the newer and better form of church.

I cannot pass on from this period of my life without offering a word of tribute to the men with whom I was most intimately associated. A nobler, more honest, sincere, and open-minded group of men it has never been my privilege to know. There was among them, in the period of my acquaintance with their work, a comradely spirit, a bond of fellowship and loyalty, which has been unsurpassed in my experiences. They were picked men, read in the books and in modern knowledge, eager for new ideas; but they were more largely read in human experiences, and in intimate acquaintance with men and women of all classes in society.

The first of these men with whom I became acquainted was Jenkin Lloyd Jones, of an old Welsh Unitarian family, emigrated to the wilds of Wisconsin in his childhood. When I first met him he was the minister of a little congregation in Winnetka, Ill., then he was for a considerable period at Janesville, Wis., and finally he located in Chicago, and built up there All Souls' Church, with a congregation not large in numbers, but strong in friendly human interests and in eagerness for new ideas. His efforts have been made triumphant in the Abraham Lincoln Centre, a big institutional building, which includes a church, and an equipment for every form of human service a great city demands. Here is published the weekly paper called UNITY, the organ of every form of progressive

thought and action in religion. The published sermons of Jenkin Jones testify amply to his originality, to his thoroughly modern conception of religion, and to the broadly sympathetic and human quality of his preaching.

Another of these men was Robert Collyer, of whom I have already spoken. I remember him in part because of his interest in my work in Wisconsin. I made an effort to secure him for a lecture, and he finally proposed to give us his "Clear Grit," if the people in Sharon would guarantee $100, that sum to be placed in my hands for my own uses. The sum secured did not quite reach that stipulated, but the lecture was delivered, and my finances profited thereby. At one of our conferences, where held my memory does not now assure me, the question of membership in the Unitarian ministry was under discussion. The Boston management had dropped from the list of ministers annually printed one or more persons who refused to accept the Christian name and to proclaim conservative Unitarian beliefs. We of the western states at that time had no sympathy with these restrictions, partly because we knew that the men who had been rejected were among the noblest and most truly religious in our ranks. These convictions were expressed in a resolution of protest unanimously adopted; and Robert Collyer said, "We will send it down to Boston like the kick of a horse." I printed this statement in my little paper, with the result that it greatly disturbed the Boston management. That was what we wished, and it helped to bring about the result desired on our part.

One of my earliest acquaintances was Charles W. Wendte, then of Chicago, and since of Cincinnati, Oakland, Newport, and Boston. Of German birth, but educated in this country, he has been in the truest sense an American. Thoroughly devoted to his profession, yet with generous interests as a student in other directions, especially in music, he has shown himself earnest and capable. In recent years he was the general secretary of The International Congress of Unitarian and other Liberal Religious Thinkers and Workers, which has held meetings in Boston, Amsterdam, Geneva, Berlin, and Paris. He was also the secretary and executive officer of The National Federation of Religious Liberals, which has held large meetings in several American cities. He has shown a special gift for managing such gatherings, and for bringing together effectively the liberal religious thinkers of many countries in great international assemblies, with some of the leading men of the world among the speakers.

When I lived in Grand Haven there came to a conference held in that city Joseph H. Crooker, who was seeking for broader religious affiliations. Afterward he was the minister of Unitarian churches in such college towns as Ann Arbor, Madison, and Helena. He has published volumes on subjects of social reform, entitled "Problems in American Society," and "Religious Freedom in American Education." On more distinctly religious subjects his books include "The Church of Today." Broad in purpose, conservative in method, he has spoken clearly and effectively to the developing religious spirit of our age.

One of the most brilliant and original of these men was Henry D. Simmons of Kenosha, afterward of Minneapolis. Restricted in his social intercourse by a nearly total deafness, he became a zealous student, and made large applications of science to his preaching. The volume published since his death entitled "Sermons in Stones" testifies abundantly to the modern quality of his discoursing, and to his ability to bring the latest knowledge to the illustration and illumination of ethics, as well as a rational and progressive type of religion. His congregations were always small, but his influence upon those who heard him was profound and lasting.

Two other men, William C. Gannett and Frederick L. Hosmer, retained much of the better phases of the transcendental type of philosophy and religion, which they expressed in sermons and poems with charm of utterance and adequacy of rational thinking. Hosmer's hymns have gone into many a modern collection, and Gannett's sermon entitled "Blessed be Drudgery" has found wide acceptance.

Jabez T. Sunderland, of Ann Arbor, London, and Toronto, who at different periods has undertaken missions to India and Japan, has a place here as one of the men I knew most intimately. For several years he edited a monthly magazine called *The Unitarian,* published at Ann Arbor and then in Boston, to which I frequently contributed book reviews and literary articles. A preacher of excellent ability, skilled in constructive theological discussion, Sunderland represents the type of Unitarian who emphasizes the worth of the Christian inheritance, and the necessity for a constructive interpretation of our modern problems along the lines of positive beliefs.

Although a Universalist in his denominational connections, William Balch of Elgin, was in closest sympathy with our little group, and, in fact, formed one of it. An eloquent preacher, though somewhat sensational, Balch vigorously condemned all sectarianism, and frequently said that the "ist" at the end of denominational names was like the hiss of a snake, and was a hint that we should keep quite clear of it. He had travelled much in Europe and Asia, and he made his discourses, which were sometimes long and rambling, interesting with reminiscences of other countries and peoples. In a degree old-fashioned and theological, Balch was a man of broad purposes and a most liberal spirit.

One other man I must mention is Thomas Kerr, who was the minister of an independent congregation in Rockford, in northern Illinois. He had been a country physician, then became a Baptist preacher, finally found his way into a very broad and unsectarian conception of religion, and drew to himself a large congregation. He was the only one amongst us whose church was crowded with a popular following. While his thought was often inchoate, and his manner of expression rambling and chaotic, he was a man of a fine and dignified presence, who could appeal effectively to great numbers of persons who were Christian by tradition, but liberal in their outlook upon life and destiny. Eloquent in speech, impressive in manner, Kerr was heard gladly wherever he spoke to such audiences as we gathered at our conferences and in our open-air meetings. I remember well that it was from him I first heard of Richard Wagner and his music. He described, in one of his sermons, Wagner's conception of all the arts joined in one grand consensus, in order that the real modern music might find a true and adequate expression. He applied this idea to the modern type of religion, which would give expression to the whole gamut of human needs and aspirations.

I have set down here my impressions and recollections of some of the men with whom I was associated. There were others whom I knew less intimately at this time, who were doubtless as able and as progressive. The men I have mentioned won my admiration, and I have never ceased to think of them with affection and

deepest regard. I am convinced that no nobler, more open-minded, and truly progressive group of men has ever been brought together in this country. In this group were included one or two women, and in later years their numbers increased to a half-dozen or more. They were freely welcomed, were received in a genuine spirit of comradeship, and they found congregations with no sex-prejudices.

GEORGE WILLIS COOKE.

(To be Continued.)

THE STUDY TABLE

A New Picture of Jesus

We started reading this book* with a prejudice against it. The first chapter presented Jesus as "the Executive"; other chapters spoke of him as the "founder of modern business" and referred to his "advertisements." Here seemed to be the suggestion that Jesus was a kind of Rotary man in ancient Palestine! Our prejudice continued when we discovered that Mr. Barton, the author, is an advertising expert, and took almost violent form when we found him speaking of the evening stars as "the first and greatest electric sign" (p. 125). Here was obviously an endeavor to shove ministers and theologians aside, and to show that it takes a modern business man to understand the Nazarene! The attempt to write up Jesus's miracles and give these in the form of modern newspaper headlines (pp. 129-136) was a kind of last straw. We have always believed in handling Jesus frankly and freely, like an ordinary character of history, but this application of Babbitt methods to New Testament criticism seemed even to us to be going too far.

A careful reading of the book, however, coupled with a deliberate endeavor to catch the viewpoint and purpose of the author, quite converted us to the acceptance of his volume. What moves Mr. Barton, at bottom, is a sense of outrage at the way Jesus has been handled by the theologians, the priests, and the pietists during the centuries gone by. He is offended by the namby-pamby sentimentalist who has emerged from the Gospel pages. He despises the ecclesiastical idol who has been set up in the churches for men's worship. He has caught the idea, basic to any true understanding of Jesus, that he was a man of exceptionally potent and lovely human qualities, and he seeks to present him as he must have been known to the people of his generation, and was interpreted by his disciples. Mr. Barton's book has superficial aspects which may well shock many an orthodox soul, but the true liberal need not be afraid. The author is reverent in the sense that he wants to know the truth, and to offer it for the salvation of men's lives. His presentation of the Gospel story is not new, but it is fresh, bold, clearly outlined and illumined by passionate conviction. We have seldom encountered a more human and likeable Jesus than is found in this volume. Certain of the more sublime and mystical qualities of the man are missed, but this is no fault, as Mr. Barton would be the last to disclaim any attempt to present a full and final interpretation of the Gospel.

We commend this book heartily. It is especially useful in an age when Fundamentalism is attempting once again to hide the real Jesus behind the veil of bad theology and silly superstition.

J. H. H.

* "The Man Nobody Knows: A Discovery of Jesus." By Bruce Barton. Published by Bobbs Merrill and Company, Indianapolis, Ind.

A Book by Dr. Sunderland

"India, America and World Brotherhood"† is a book published primarily for Indian readers; but no person interested in mastering the best of American ideals, the struggle for freedom in India, its relation to the future of the British Empire, and the necessary requisites for having a World Brotherhood, through better understanding between the East and West can afford to miss its perusal. Dr. Sunderland has visited the Orient several times and for the last thirty years has studied and written on Indian questions with a spirit of sympathy and justice.

In Part I of the book Dr. Sunderland gives a vivid portrait of three great Americans, Abraham Lincoln, William Lloyd Garrison, and Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, representing American idealism in political life, social service and emancipation of women towards greater freedom. Any people looking towards progress must have to assimilate the ideals represented in these lives.

Part II of the book deals with India's struggle for self-determination. Every one interested in knowing the truth about the Indian situation and its possible solution on the basis of continuance of friendly relations between India and England should pay special attention to this part of the book. In it Dr. Sunderland discusses Indian political, economic, educational problems, Mahatma Gandhi, The Non-co-operation Movement, The Reform Scheme, "What Shall England Do?" etc., in a masterly fashion but without complexity. He suggests that India should be given a "responsible" Government, and to bring about this, a conference be called of representatives of Indian people and the British Government and that a program meeting Indian demands, which will be compatible with Indian progress, be drawn up in the near future to check the ever-growing bitterness of the people of India.

In Part III the author in discussing the problems of "World Brotherhood" pleads that "if antagonism between Asiatic and European nations is to be removed, Europe must treat the older continent with more justice than too often she has done in the past or is doing today." He further suggests that there should be a greater spirit of toleration practiced among religious groups; and the spirit that should dominate the religious workers of different creeds should not be "conversion," but sympathetic understanding and co-operation to supplement one another towards the attainment of the great ideal of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man.

It is a great book and it should be in every important library of the English-speaking world, if not in all institutions for higher education.

TARAKNATH DAS.

† "India, America and World Brotherhood." By Rev. J. T. Sunderland, M.A., D.D. Madras (India). Ganesh & Co. 1925. pp. 295. Not at present for sale in this country.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS—ESSENCE AND EXCRESCENCE

Editor UNITY:

The current discussion of the Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes makes it opportune to clarify the distinction between what is essential in the League of Nations and what is an excrescence thereon. There is good authority for the use of these terms in this connection. Sir Arthur Salter, Director of the Economic and Financial Section of the League of Nations, in a lecture last summer at the Williamstown Institute of Politics, said of the League: "It is essentially an organized system of conferences, designed to facilitate agreement." That is an exact statement of the essence of the League.

It is Senator Pepper, of Pennsylvania, who has used the word "excrescence" in discussing the League. In an address in the spring of 1923, he declared that the Covenant sanctions, that is, provisions for the coercion of faith-breaking nations, "will not work." He said: "An organization to force nations to behave is bound to fail." Asserting that there should be "a frank acknowledgment that the coercive features conceived at Versailles have no rightful place in the Covenant," he called for a rewriting of that instrument, deeming it "not a difficult piece of surgery to cut out of the Covenant the excrescences which, while left there, are sources of danger."

What is essential in the League ought to be upheld. The excrescences ought to be removed. International conferences to discuss matters of common concern are excellent, full of promise for the improvement of international relations. But —to quote another Senator, now chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Borah—"the use of force when applied to people collectively, that is, to states or nations, is unsound in principle." It is also impracticable, as Senator Pepper has said. Nevertheless it is enjoined in the Covenant in certain contingencies, and the members of the League have accepted it as an obligation. Thus there is a wise and useful element in the present League and also a worthless and dangerous element,—essence and excrescence.

As an "organized system of conferences" the League has made a record of notable achievement. The Assembly, representing fifty nations, has had five annual sessions. The Council, representing four great powers and six (formerly four) other countries, has met thirty-two times in the past five years. The Secretariat, on the job all the year round as a bureau of world affairs,—registering treaties, investigating conditions, studying problems, publishing information,—has become a very efficient medium for the promotion of justice and peace between the nations. A half-dozen international disputes serious enough to threaten war have been settled through the agency of the League. Austria and Hungary have been helped to a better financial footing. A World Court has been established at the Hague. As a splendid climax to the short history of the League, the Assembly voted unanimously last September in favor of the Protocol providing for the pacific settlement of all international disputes and declaring aggressive war an international crime.

All these good things and others not here mentioned which belong to the credit of the League have been done by peaceable means. No force has been employed save moral force, the compelling power of the enlightened public opinion of the world. Conference has promoted mutual understanding; and good sense, common decency, good will—which are not lacking in any nation—have done the rest, finding through the League effective expression.

It looked as if the sanctions of the Covenant were a dead letter, and those who do not believe in war under any circumstances rejoiced thereat, the coercion of a nation being war, no matter what you call it. Then came the Protocol. Alas! besides making admirable provisions for the pacific settlement of disputes, it undertook to give life to the Covenant sanctions, specifying in detail how to execute them against a nation guilty of bad faith. The Covenant itself is vague in this regard and it is likely that many nations entered the League with but slight consideration of the obligation involved to engage in war in certain conditions. That obligation was the insuperable objection that kept the United States from joining. We were not willing to guarantee "against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League," as Article 10 of the Covenant stipulated, nor to promise to boycott some country, we knew not which, that might in the future violate its plighted faith, nor to undertake to send our army and navy into foreign parts to deal with a situation that could not possibly be fully known beforehand. Therefore we kept out of the League, and we shall stay out as long as joining it involves such obligations.

Now that the Protocol has compelled thorough consideration of these stumbling blocks, it appears that our country's unwillingness to pledge itself for future war is shared by some of the members of the League. In particular the self-governing British Dominions, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, seem as reluctant as we are to be bound by the coercive provisions of the Covenant, if those provisions are really going to be taken seriously, as the Protocol with its specifications of procedure seems to insure. Accordingly the British Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, has informed the Council, lately in session, that Britain will not ratify the Protocol. That settles its fate. The conference for the reduction of armaments, scheduled to follow the ratification of the Protocol by at least three of the great powers and ten of the lesser nations, is indefinitely postponed. Likewise the proposed agreement for the peaceable settlement of all disputes is abandoned for the present.

Thus the good in the Protocol goes down with the bad. The good will come back. Comprehensive arbitration treaties, in which no exception is made of questions touching "national honor" or "vital interests," will be made by the nations that are wise enough without waiting for the League as a whole to take so advanced a position. Switzerland and Italy have just made such a treaty. The two great English-speaking peoples ought to do the like at once, as Mr. Taft advocated when he was President.

Will the bad in the Protocol stay dead, thus insuring that the bad in the Covenant, the "excrescences," will continue to be a dead letter until cut out as they ought to be, or will the futile effort to "force nations to behave" be renewed? Will the peoples depend on might for their security, or will they learn that just dealing and a friendly attitude are their best protection? Shall mutual suspicion enter into international compacts, finding expression in elaborate provisions for dealing with bad faith, or shall good faith be fostered by being taken for granted?

Boston, Mass. HENRY W. PINKHAM.

IS "UNITY" CONSTRUCTIVE?

Editor UNITY:

I always read your editorials with interest, but cannot say that I find much constructive work in them. I am proud to say as a student of political economy for many years that I am "fed up" on liberal thought. I am asked to subscribe again to UNITY, but really there is nothing but the "be good" note. How to be good by planting oneself on fundamentals is an absent quantity. The *Nation*, to which I subscribe, also gives no information on fundamental thought. In UNITY of March 16th you deplore the disintegration of the Progressive Party and the reactionary position of labor representatives. If ever there was a Kilkenny Cat Party it was the Progressive Party. The Lord save us from the opposing factions making up this party. If it had been successful, I am sure we would have had people working at odds because of lack of cohesion. . .

To give fact after fact and a criticism of every violation of freedom throughout the world, without a hint of the evil of the monopoly of land at this late day is unpardonable. Anna Louise Strong, whom I heard the other evening on Russia, declares the Soviets are conceding the right to private capital to produce things, but the land and other key monopolies are not allowed to be owned privately. That is all we contend for here. Let people produce freely, but do not allow them to hold land in fee simple. Unless we commence to educate people in what is mine through honest labor and what is thine as a community through communal value attaching to civilization, we have confusion. . .

If the problem of editing UNITY is beyond my ken, I hope you will forgive my criticism. Yet I feel the problem of social unity so deeply, I cannot do other than express my sentiments as given. With best wishes. M. L.

[REPLY]

This sincere and sympathetic friend does not mean that our editorials are not "constructive"; he means only that they do not advocate constantly and exclusively the single tax. We have one more instance, here, in other words, of a friend refusing to recognize a constructive program because it does not happen to be *his* constructive program. As a matter of fact,

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

THE TENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE UNION OF DEMOCRATIC CONTROL, LONDON, ENGLAND.

The tenth annual meeting of the Union of Democratic Control took place on Friday, March 13, at the Caxton Hall, Westminster, with Arthur Ponsonby, M.P., in the chair. Among others there were present the Right Hon. Charles P. Trevelyan, M.P., Arnold Forster, F. J. Shaw, Professor R. Beazley, George Aitken, Harrison Barrow, Gilbert Dale, Miss M. E. Durham.

The following members were elected to the Executive Committee for 1925:—

Executive: Prof. C. Raymond Beazley, J. M. Fells, Hamilton Fyfe, J. A. Hobson, H. B. Lees-Smith, M.P., S. E. Morel (Secretary), Oswald Mosley, Arthur Ponsonby, M.P., Rosslyn Mitchell, M.P., The Hon. Bertrand Russell, F. J. Shaw, H. M. Swanwick (Editor, *Foreign Affairs*), The Rt. Hon. C. P. Trevelyan, M.P. (Treasurer).

The Six Points

The Council decided that the original five points of the Union of Democratic Control, to which a sixth was added in 1919, should be revised and brought into line with the policy embodied in the new "Charter of Peace," which was published last December. The amended constitution now reads as follows:—

Future and Immediate Policy of the U.D.C.

I. Democratic Control.

(a) To create and maintain among the peoples an interest in foreign affairs and to enter into the widest possible international relations of friendship and co-operation.

(b) To secure the abolition of Parliamentary practice or traditional custom which gives power or opportunity to Governments without Parliamentary sanction or the knowledge of their peoples to conclude with other Governments, Treaties, or Agreements, or understandings of any kind whatsoever (either through their Civil or Military, Naval, or Air Departments) involving collaboration in war or in preparation for war.

II. Armaments and Armed Forces.

To secure a common reduction of armaments to the level required for internal order and international police work, involving the abolition of conscription, and the prohibition, under the severest penalties, of private manufacture and trade in armaments and war material of every description, with international inspection under the League.

III. League of Nations.

To secure:—

(a) The development and improvement of the League into an all-inclusive institution of international control for the prevention of war.

(b) The development of the organs of arbitration and conciliation for the settlement of every kind of international dispute, and the immediate acceptance by all States, of the obligation to submit every kind of dispute to International Arbitration or Conciliation or to the decision of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

(c) The application in the case of mandated areas of the professed intention of the Covenant that the charge of people not yet able to stand by themselves should form a "sacred trust of civilization," and that this principle should be extended to all territories similar in character.

(d) The development of the numerous departments of the League of Nations aiming at international co-operation in scientific, technical, and humanitarian activities.

(e) The appointment of a permanent Advisory Commission of the League of Nations to receive reports from racial groups or minorities with a view to ensuring equitable conditions, and where

Patriotism Is Not Enough

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

¶ The title is a direct quotation from Edith Cavell's last words, and the book is devoted to explaining what those last words really meant. "A citizen of America," says the author, "must in the end be a citizen of the world." Dr. Holmes attacks "stand-patism" and "normalcy," brands as "propaganda" the teaching of patriotism as it is now conducted in schools and colleges alike, and describes our common-school histories as being one-sided and provincial. He accompanies his destructive criticism with a constructive program of betterment. Withal, the book is written in a temperate, well-reasoned manner and shows profound learning.

$2.00

GREENBERG, PUBLISHER, Inc.

112 East 19th Street NEW YORK

we have never attempted to present in UNITY anybody's program but our own. And as a matter of fact, also, this program of ours includes the single tax. We have been a single taxer ever since we read Henry George's immortal masterpiece, "Progress and Poverty." But we have no more idea that this is the final and perfect and complete word in economics than that Channing's doctrine of Unitarianism is the final and perfect and complete word in theology. We refuse to be a sectarian in the one case exactly as in the other. J. H. H.

A LABOR LEADER REPLIES!

Editor of UNITY:

I have just been shown a copy of UNITY for March 16, containing an editorial criticizing Organized Labor in America.

It has never been my policy to excuse or defend the mistakes or the wrongs in the Labor Movement of this country. But I feel that I must protest against the extreme nature and unfair spirit of the editorial in which you make the following statements: "Organized Labor in this country is shown once again to be a sham. It has no intelligence, no courage, no vision. It is high time that we came to understand that organized labor is just as much engaged in the business of public exploitation in this country as organized capital. Labor has no interest in progress, no concern for reform, no passion for social justice. It is interested exclusively in its own petty and selfish affairs at any expense of public welfare and happiness."

I am not going to argue with you, but I wish to ask you to examine carefully this sweeping, wholesale indictment, and to ask yourself if the statements in it should not be modified, or at least qualified. They seem to me very unjust, and I think I could prove to any fair-minded person that they are unjust. One reason why I cannot now take them up with you is that as an official of Organized Labor my time is fully occupied in fighting for "progress, reform, and social justice" during the meeting of the State Legislature. Organized Labor has borne the brunt of this same fight over a longer period than any other organized body in America, instead of being "as much engaged in the business of public exploitation as organized capital."

I must protest against another reckless statement in this same editorial. It is that Labor's interest is focused upon "silly inconsequentialities about wages, hours, etc." If you were in closer contact with the actual lives and real struggles of the workers you would realize that wages, hours, etc., were not "silly inconsequentialities." I would respectfully advise you to make such contact (for instance among the unemployed bituminous miners of this state) if you wish to understand and to help (as I feel sure you do) organized labor to cure its faults and to win its rights.

I trust your sense of fairness will lead you to place this letter before the readers who were reached by your editorial.

Very truly yours,

JAMES H. MAURER.

Office, Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, Harrisburg, Penna.

necessary, advising modifications of the Peace Treaties, in accordance with the impartially ascertained will of the inhabitants.

(f) Careful exploration of the possibility of developing Articles eleven and nineteen of the Covenant, so as to make the peaceful revision of Treaties practicable at the earliest possible moment.

IV. Economic Development.

(a) To promote free commercial and personal intercourse between all nations and to preserve and extend the principle of the open door.

(b) That the Government support given to investors, who place their capital abroad, must never amount to the use of the threat of war.

A WHO'S WHO FOR AMERICAN LABOR

For the first time in the history of the American Labor Movement, the personal histories of its leaders have been collected in book form, in the American Labor Who's Who, to be brought out in March by the Hanford Press, New York.

The book will contain more than 1,500 concise biographies, including a special section with over 200 of the most prominent European labor men and women. The field covered includes trade unionism, labor, politics, labor journalism, workers' education, and co-operation.

Arrangements will be made for a special price for the book within all branches of the labor movement.

THE INTERNATIONAL POLYTECHNICAL UNIVERSITY (I. P. U.)

The I. P. U. is defined on its letterhead as "An International Association for the Promotion of the New Techno-Cultural Education through the establishing of International Polytechnical Universities on a Self-Supporting Agricultural Basis."

Its headquarters are at Los Angeles, California, Room 506, Tajo Building, which is on the corner of First and Broadway. Communications sent there may be addressed to Dr. Nahum Kavinoky, President, or to Robert Whitaker, 1st Vice-President.

The I. P. U. is the "New School" in action. It is international both in spirit, and in the range of its operation, vocational, in that its whole conception of education rests on an industrial basis.

It is technical, not in the narrow sense of manual or vocational training, for the efficiency of exploitation, but in the far more fundamental and comprehensive way of resting its whole conception of education upon the primacy of the productive process in the making of man and his institutions. Therefore it is "polytechnical," embracing the whole.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove

Tel., Atlantic 1876

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM DOMESTIC COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028

Main Office 608 S. Dearborn St.

CHICAGO

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

For Active Thinkers

BOWMAN'S MILK is rich in energy. It is a valuable aid to clear thinking.

It is easily assimilated. Does not overburden the digestive organs.

BOWMAN DAIRY Company

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor—large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

IN APRIL

Comes Easter as the signal for introducing your clothes of a new season. Spring demands an appropriate wardrobe—and there is no greater economy to be practiced than the use of our service which so expertly cleanses and freshens each previously worn garment that you send us.

Schumann & Co. Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 6281 : : : : : ALL DEPARTMENTS MAIN OFFICE AND WORK

3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

Subscribe for and read UNITY

224